Patterns of Humanization and Dehumanization and the Development of Trust: Unity and Divisions Within and Between the Muslim World

Noraini Noor
INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA

11/21/2016
Final Report

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Executive Services, Directorate (0704-0188). Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.
PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ORGANIZATION.

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED (From - To)
23-11-2016	Final	28 Aug 2015 to 27 Aug 2016

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
Patterns of Humanization and Dehumanization and the Development of Trust: Unity and Divisions Within and Between the Muslim World

5a. CONTRACT NUMBER

5b. GRANT NUMBER
FA2386-15-1-4021

5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER
61102F

6. AUTHOR(S)
Noraini Noor

5d. PROJECT NUMBER

5e. TASK NUMBER

5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA
JALAN GOMBAK
KUALA LUMPUR, 53100 MY

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
AOARD
UNIT 45002
APO AP 96338-5002

10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
AFRL/AFOSR IOA

11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)
AFRL-AFOSR-JP-TR-2016-0094

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
A DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED: PB Public Release

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT
The research was designed to identify and more fully understand humanizing and dehumanizing processes, and the association between these processes with trust and distrust within the Muslim World in different geohistorical contexts, namely, Malaysia, Philippines, Pakistan and the UK. The paucity of research on humanization was a major impetus in carrying the research because in contrast to work on dehumanization, little is known regarding the humanization construct. Combined results showed that dehumanization and distrust of the Other coincided and increased between conflicting groups after a contested event. In these studies, the conceptions of dehumanization varied depending on the geohistorical context. The nature of dehumanization also varied depending on the source and target. Humanization, while less often referenced, was also observed and it too, was dependent on geohistorical context. As in the case of dehumanization, the qualities of humanization did not conform to the binary conception as the opposite of animal or machine-like characteristics mostly found in Western research. Another important finding from these studies is the conflation between ethnic/racial groups with religion and identity, and this was observed in all the geohistorical context. While each study considered a particular salient difference between the conflicting groups, such as ethnicity or religion, how much of the (de)humanization or (dis)trust of the Other is really attributed to that individual marker as opposed to the complexity of identities as consisting of multiple differences, is something that needs more work. Taken together, the research calls for a new conception of the meaning of dehumanization and by implication, what it means to be human. While traditional research narrowly defines dehumanization in a rather static way, as lacking those qualities that are essentially or uniq

15. SUBJECT TERMS
AOARD, humanization, dehumanization, trust, muslim, mart

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	**b. ABSTRACT**	**c. THIS PAGE**			AHLERS, KRISTOPHER
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified	SAR	8	**19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER** (Include area code) 315-227-7009

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8/98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39.18

Final Report for AOARD Grant No: FA2386-15-1-4021
"Patterns of Humanization and Dehumanization and the Development of Trust: Unity and Divisions Within and Between the Muslim World"

Date: November 21, 2016

PI and Co-PI information:

Professor Noraini M. Noor (Co-PI)
Email: noraini@iium.edu.my
Institution, Department & Mailing address: International Islamic University Malaysia,
Department of Psychology, Jalan Gombak, 53100 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Phone Number: 603-61965131
Fax Number: 603-61964870

Professor Daniel J. Christie (Co-PI)
Email: Christie.1@osu.edu
Institution, Department & Mailing Address: The Ohio State University, Department of
Psychology, Columbus, Ohio 43210 USA
Phone Number: 740-972-1230

Period of Performance: 08/28/2015 – 08/27/2016

Abstract: Short summary of most important research results that explain why the work was done, what was accomplished, and how it pushed scientific frontiers or advanced the field.   This summary will be used for archival purposes and will be added to a searchable DoD database.

The research was designed to identify and more fully understand humanizing and dehumanizing processes, and the association between these processes with trust and distrust within the Muslim World in different geohistorical contexts, namely, Malaysia, Philippines, Pakistan and the UK. A total of six studies were carried out.

The paucity of research on humanization was a major impetus in carrying the research because in contrast to work on dehumanization, not much is known regarding the humanization construct. We consider this lack of research as a missed opportunity in light of the potential significance of humanizing tendencies as a precursor to constructive intergroup relations.

Our combined results showed that dehumanization and distrust of the Other coincided and increased between conflicting groups after a contested event (such as an election in Malaysia, a heated conflict in the Philippines, influx of migrants or the July 7 bombing in the UK). In these studies, the conceptions of dehumanization varied depending on the geohistorical context. The nature of dehumanization also varied depending on the source and target. Humanization, while less often referenced, was also observed and it too, was dependent on geohistorical context. As in the case of dehumanization, the qualities of humanization did not conform to the binary conception as the opposite of animal or machine-like characteristics mostly found in Western research.

Another important finding from these studies is the conflation between ethnic/racial

groups with religion and identity, and this was observed in all the geohistorical context. While each study considered a particular salient difference between the conflicting groups, such as ethnicity or religion, how much of the (de)humanization or (dis)trust of the Other is really attributed to that individual marker as opposed to the complexity of identities as consisting of multiple differences, is something that needs more work.

Taken together, the research calls for a new conception of the meaning of dehumanization and by implication, what it means to be human. While traditional research narrowly defines dehumanization in a rather static way, as lacking those qualities that are essentially or uniquely human, our work suggests dehumanization can be conceived dynamically as in part an event driven phenomenon in which the range of essential human qualities attributed to the Other can be expanded or contracted. Moreover, the nature of (de)humanizing processes are context dependent, suggesting geohistorical underpinnings that are capable of changing with time and place.

In a practical sense, the malleability of (de)humanizing processes and their association with (dis)trust opens the possibility of improving relations between groups through an increased awareness of the many and varied manifestations of dehumanizing processes and the encouragement of more salutary relations through efforts to humanize and develop trust in the Other.

Introduction: Include a summary of specific aims of the research and describe the importance and ultimate goal of the work.

Each of the six studies had different research questions and the details of each can be seen in the respective papers that are attached.

We collaborated with colleagues in Malaysia, Philippines, the UK and Pakistan to carry out studies within our respective geohistorical contexts that relate to (de)humanization and (dis)trust. We were receptive to new methodologies that each might deem appropriate within their varied contexts. In the Malaysian study, the (de)humanizing divide was based mainly on ethnicity (majority Malays versus minority Chinese) while in the Philippines the marker was religion (majority Christian versus minority Muslim in Mindanao). The first study in Pakistan also focused on the Muslim-Christian divide (but with opposite power relation between the two as compared to the Philippines study), while the second was on the Sunni-Shīite split. The final two UK studies examined the public portrayal of Muslims in public discourse centering on (i) immigration, and (ii) the July 7th terrorist bombing in London; again using religion as the salient marker.

Experiment: Description of the experiment(s)/theory and equipment or analyses.

Four of the studies used very similar methods (Malaysia, Pakistan-Study 1, UK-Studies 1 and 2), where two sets of newspapers were utilized as sources of data (left vs right-wing newspapers, ethnic- or religious-based newspapers, or most widely read newspapers), which were then analyzed by content or themes. The Philippines study used both print and social media sources for their data which were quantified by test-mining and later computed a correlation between (de)humanization and trust. In other words, the study used both qualitative and quantitative methods. The Pakistan-Study 2 used a Foucauldian discourse analysis in

understanding the Sunni-Shīite split.

Results and Discussion: Describe significant experimental and/or theoretical research advances or findings and their significance to the field and what work may be performed in the future as a follow on project. Fellow researchers will be interested to know what impact this research has on your particular field of science.

Significant Findings

First, while dehumanization is most often treated as a binary conception in the scholarly literature, referencing the Other as either animal or machine-like, our research program yielded a wide range of conceptions of dehumanization that varied depending on geohistorical context. The nature of dehumanization also varied as a function of the target and source of dehumanization.

For example, in Pakistan, a country with the historical legacy of the caste system, a lack of cleanliness was often coterminous with dehumanization. In the Philippines, Christians were often dehumanized with the word *kafir* or non-believer. In contrast, when the target was Muslim, Christians used words such as *Satanas* (Satan) and *demonyo* (demon).

Second, in addition to finding a wide array of semantic referents for dehumanization that varied with geohistorical context, source and target, we also found evidence for humanization, in which the Other was said to possess qualities that were essential to humanness. Again, however, the qualities of humanization did not neatly conform to the binary conception of humanization as the semantic opposite of animal or machine-like characteristics. For instance, among Muslims in Pakistan, scripture-based injunctions characterize humanness as having the qualities of authentic religiosity, fidelity and conscientiousness.

Third, research findings have suggested a number of potentially fruitful lines of research that could contribute to the development of theory and in particular concepts and relations that bear on humanizing and dehumanizing processes. For example, we learned from the Malaysian study, that the nature of (dis)trust and (de)humanization vary depending on the source and target. Moreover, Malays' trust and distrust of Chinese was centered on Chinese actions while Chinese trust and distrust of Malays was based on the presumed character of Malays. Importantly, in all of the studies humanizing statements and trust of the Other were positively related, as were dehumanization and distrust. The role of social identity and identity-related values were also explored. In the Malaysia context, rival groups refrained from dehumanizing sensitive identity-related values of the Other but often dehumanized the other in relation to peripheral values that did not bear of the social identity of the Other.

Fourth, while evidence was found for an ideologically-based origin of dehumanization, such as in the case of the Sunni-Shiite conflict in Pakistan, one of the more important findings of the research was the event-driven nature of (de)humanizing processes. In Malaysia, for instance, the 2013 national election triggered dehumanizing and distrustful responses by Malays and Malaysian Chinese. In contrast, the 9/11 attacks on the US was associated with a decrease in dehumanization and a corresponding increase in humanization toward Christians in Pakistan. These findings call into question static conceptions of (de)humanization processes and underscore the dynamic and context sensitive nature of these processes.

Fifth, there were a number of theoretical implications of our work that could be marshaled in an effort to account for event-driven changes in (de)humanization. For instance, the spike in dehumanization following the 2013 national elections in Malaysia was interpreted through the lens of equity in the relationship implying that one condition that can trigger dehumanization processes is the perception that the equity in a relationship between groups has been violated. In the context of the 2015 UK General Election Campaign, dehumanizing discourses were associated with symbolic and realistic threats while humanization was associated with shared identity and the need for strong leadership.

New Research Questions for Future Work

We have yet to fully understand the instrumental value of (de)humanization: does (de)humanization serve as a social lens through which we position ourselves in relation to Others and interpret the actions of Others who populate our life space? Does (de)humanization serve an ego-protective function, an identity preserving function, and/or a political expediency function? If dehumanization is conceived as an event-driven constriction of the range of essential human qualities we see in Others within a particular geohistorical context, does rehumanization imply the restoration of the status quo ante? More broadly, under what conditions are essential human qualities of the Other expanded and contracted?

The current research also points to the potential value of designing future research in ways that explore the antecedents, consequences and semantic contours of humanization. Indeed, the paucity of research on "humanization" as a construct is a missed opportunity particularly in light of the potential importance of humanizing tendencies as an antecedent to constructive intergroup relations.

In addition, the consistency of the association between trust and humanization, on one hand, and distrust and dehumanization on the other suggests a robust relationship between these concepts that warrant further research. Although we found consistent associations between (de)humanization and (dis)trust across research projects, the research design we employed did not permit us to infer causality. Given the consistent associations we found, it would seem fruitful and important for future research to begin the process of exploring causal links between (de)humanization and (dis)trust. Such an approach could begin to map moderators and mediators of these constructs, thereby contributing to theory construction. In a practical sense, the literature on trust has already provided evidence for the proposition that once trust in a relationship is damaged, it can be extraordinarily difficult to restore trust. Findings indicating a causal link between humanization and trust whether direct or indirect could point to the possibility of restoring trust through humanizing processes.

Finally, we also found it useful to distinguish between (de)humanization and (in)humane behavior, the former of which pertains to qualities of the Other, while the latter implies actions of the Other. In the present research, we noted this distinction but did not further explore its implications. Future research could follow-up on this distinction and work toward a nomological network that includes other constructs that bear on the improvement of intergroup relations.

List of Publications and Significant Collaborations that resulted from your AOARD supported project: In standard format showing authors, title, journal, issue, pages, and date, for each category list the following:
a) papers published in peer-reviewed journals,
b) papers published in non-peer-reviewed journals or in conference proceedings,
c) conference presentations,

We presented some of the findings as a panel on "Humanization and Dehumanization" at the 39th Annual Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, July 13-16, 2016, in Warsaw, Poland **(see the file on ISPP Panel)**.

d) manuscripts submitted but not yet published,

Six papers have been produced from this collaborative research. Four have been submitted to appropriate peer-reviewed journals, while the other two are still in the process of finalization pending submission (**all six articles are attached in the file on AOARD papers**).

The following are the titles of the six papers, together with the author and journal names:

Noor, Govindasamy, & Christie. Humanizing and dehumanizing in an intractible ethnic conflict: Relationships to (in)equity, (dis)trust, and identity-related values. Submitted to *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*

Montiel, Velasquez, de la Paz, & Cerafica. Muslim-Christian trust and (de)humanization in the public sphere: text-mining print and social media during a heated intergroup conflict. Submitted to *British Journal of Social Psychology*

McKeown, Haji, Byrant, de la Paz & Flothmann. (De)humanization of Muslim immigrants: Left and Right newspaper and public discourse during the UK 2015 general election. Submitted to *Political Psychology*

Haji, McKeown Jones, & Matthews. Left vs. Right: (De)humanization and (Dis)trust of Muslims in UK Media Following the July 7th London Bombings. Submitted to *British Journal of Social Psychology*

Ahmed & Zahoor. The impact of the 9/11 on de-humanization and humanization of minority Christians in Pakistan: Analysis of newspaper reporting (to be submitted)

Sajjad & Ali. Patterns of (de)humanization and prospects of trust-building: The case of Sunni-Shī'ite contestation in contemporary Pakistan (to be submitted)

e) provide a list any interactions with industry or with Air Force Research Laboratory scientists or significant collaborations that resulted from this work.

Recently, Dan Christie and Noraini Noor, together with another colleague from Australia were invited to facilitate a workshop on (De)humanization, (De)colonization and (De)coloniality for UNISA—South African Medical Research Council, in Lenasia, Johannesburg, November 1-2, 2016. We hope this collaboration will continue.

Noraini Noor will be presenting some of this work at the Psychology Festival and Belt and Road Discussion at Renmin University of China, Beijing, November 23-26, 2016.

Dan Christie will also be presenting the findings of this collaborative research at the Peace Psychology Symposium next year in Italy, May 21-27, 2017.

DD882:   As a separate document, please complete and sign the inventions disclosure form.

Important Note: If the work has been adequately described in refereed publications, submit an abstract as described above but cite important findings to your above List of Publications, and if possible, attach any reprint(s) as an appendix. If a full report needs to be written, then submission of a final report that is very similar to a full length journal article will be sufficient in most cases.

This document may be as long or as short as needed to give a fair account of the work performed during the period of performance. There will be variations depending on the scope of the work. As such, there is no length or formatting constraints for the final report. Keep in mind the amount of funding you received relative to the amount of effort you put into the report. For example, do not submit a $300k report for $50k worth of funding; likewise, do not submit a $50k report for $300k worth of funding. Include as many charts and figures as required to explain the work.